



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the consideration of the ethics of the Old Testament in general. No one can fail to find the book stimulating and instructive, if not at all points conclusive.

GEORGE RICKER BERRY.

COLGATE UNIVERSITY.

BEITRÄGE ZUR ENTSTEHUNGSGESCHICHTE DES PENTATEUCHS. Von
D. AUGUST KLOSTERMANN.

THIS is the title of a series of articles in the *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* (January–May, 1897), a continuation of some previous articles on the same subject, which were subsequently republished in book form. The object of the present series is stated to be, not the discussion of all the various archaeological and historical questions which might be raised, but simply the literary and historical investigation as to authorship, date, and original form of the primitive pentateuchal narrative. In the execution of this purpose the writer confines himself to two features of that narrative: (1) the description of the Mosaic sanctuary and (2) of the arrangement of the Israelitish camp (Ex., chaps. 25–31 and 35–40). These two features are selected as central points, as it were, of great importance, around which all other subordinate matters are grouped.

After briefly setting forth the fundamental nature of these two subjects as treated in the pentateuchal narrative, the writer next proceeds to an investigation of the state of the text. The different Hebrew and Greek texts, as they stand today, show traces of many different recensions. While remarkable differences exist between the Greek and the Hebrew, *e. g.*, in those sections which treat of the construction and furnishing of the sanctuary (Ex., chaps. 36–40), it must also be noted that the different Greek texts differ among themselves. Even the pre-hexaplar Greek text must have presented a mixture of different translations, or different recensions, and investigation shows also that the Vatican text, as compared with Origen's *Hexaplar*, goes back to a simpler and briefer type differing materially from the present Hebrew text. In its present form, however, it resembles the Hebrew text more closely. This, however, is the result of later changes and additions. As it now stands, even those portions, *e. g.*, certain verses in chaps. 35, 36, and 37, which seem to be most literally translated from the Hebrew, when studied more carefully, make the impression of careful arrangement and fitting together of different fragments. The conclusion is reached, accordingly, that the Hebrew text of Ex., chaps. 25–40,

is, in the main, unquestionably more original and trustworthy than the Greek texts, as they now stand, although even the Hebrew text presents traces of different recensions.

One such trace is discovered in the use of the terms **עֲדֹת** and **בְּרִית**. The confusion with which these terms seem to be used leads to a special investigation of their use and significance. As the result of this investigation of the symbolism embodied in the ark it is maintained that in the original pentateuchal narrative the ark was called the ark of the **בְּרִית**, because it contained the tables of the **בְּרִית**, or, briefly, the **בְּרִית**. It was called the **עֲדֹת** ark, or the **עֲדֹת**, because it symbolized the invisible presence of God, who is enthroned among the cherubim. At a later time this distinction was lost sight of, and the expressions "ark of the **בְּרִית**" and "ark of the **עֲדֹת**" were regarded as synonymous, and hence "tables of the **עֲדֹת**" and "tables of the **בְּרִית**" were used interchangeably, and finally a recension took place which substituted **עֲדֹת** for **בְּרִית** in many places. This substitution, however, was not accomplished with such uniformity in the Septuagint as in the Hebrew.

Another point taken up is the relation of the expressions **אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד** and **מִשְׁכָן יְהוָה**. These terms seem to be used interchangeably, and yet careful investigation shows that the expression **אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד** is inserted in many places where it does not belong.

As a result of these investigations it is maintained that: (1) At a very early period the pentateuchal narrative was a literary unity, but a composite unity, so to speak, formed by combining three elements, (a) fragments of narratives and anecdotes using the expression "ark of the Covenant," "ark of Jehovah," and in which the sanctuary was called **אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד** ; (b) liturgical directions which also used the term **אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד** ; (c) an account of the divine command to erect a sanctuary and an account of the fulfillment of this command, in which the ark was called "the ark of the **עֲדֹת**" or "the **עֲדֹת**," and the sanctuary was called "the **מִשְׁכָן** of the **עֲדֹת**," or "the **מִשְׁכָן**." In order to bear out this last-named point, however, the text of the passage (Ex. 33:7-11) must be changed so as to make it contain an account of the command of Jehovah to erect a sanctuary. (2) It is maintained that the modern designation of P as the author of Ex. 25-31 and 35-40, and of the bulk of Leviticus, is misleading, useless, and meaningless.

On the one hand, a merely superficial examination of the vocabulary of the present Hebrew text furnishes a very uncertain criterion on which to form a judgment as to identity or diversity of the authorship

of the various portions, for the specific occurrence of specific terms is often the result of subsequent recensions. And, on the other hand, a more careful study of these different terms, *e.g.*, and **מישׁך עיר בירתה** and **אַהֲל מָוֶעֶד**, shows that P itself is by no means homogeneous, but a composite. To divide the Pentateuch into J and P and D is like the tailors dividing the world into tailors and non-tailors.

In regard to this whole investigation and its results, it must be observed that both Klostermann and some of his critics and reviewers lay too much stress on minute differences of vocabulary as the ground of analyzing the Pentateuch into its supposed documents. That, although a strong, is by no means the strongest ground of the supposed division. A much stronger ground is the study of the history of Israel. That study reveals (or is alleged to reveal) an evident gradation in the laws of the Pentateuch (or Hexateuch), discrepancies between alleged laws and the real historical situation and transactions, and correspondence between historical periods and the ascertained strata of laws. After considerable ingenious speculation on the symbolism conveyed in the pentateuchal narrative concerning the ark and its belongings and surroundings, some rather arbitrary and capricious emendations of the text, similar to those which have been noticed in the writer's commentary on the books of Samuel and of Kings, and some fanciful theorizing as to what the narrative might have contained in its original form, the fourth and last installment of these articles takes up the question of the probable date of the composition of these chapters.

The current hypothesis of Wellhausen is subjected to a keen criticism. This hypothesis finds one of its supports in the vision of Ezekiel. Ezekiel, it is alleged, draws upon his fancy and depicts a new temple and describes its cultus, with the intention of having this temple and its cultus adopted in the religious life of the people. In the same way the pentateuchal narrative is a deliberate fiction for the purpose of foisting a new system of cultus upon the people. Klostermann, however, points out the difference between Ezekiel and the pentateuchal narrative. Ezekiel is professedly a prophet, who consciously and avowedly speaks of the ideal and the future. The Pentateuch, however, is a narrative, and professes to relate sober and well-authenticated facts. The desire to influence the cultus of his people or impose innovations of cultus is nowhere hinted at.

It might easily be argued against Klostermann, however, that the very fact that Ezekiel, speaking in his own name as a prophet and

using the form of prophetic vision, did not succeed in actualizing his ideals of cultus might easily have led the supposed author of the Pentateuch (or P) to try the other plan of anonymous historical narrative as more likely to produce the desired result.

Again, Klostermann argues that the story of the ark and the tabernacle in the wilderness was not likely to have been suggested by the erection of Solomon's temple, because Solomon's temple derived its sanctity only from the presence of the ark.

The difficulties and objections in the way of accepting the current Wellhausen hypothesis are presented in a masterful manner. On the supposition that it was a deliberate fiction, the difficulties in the way of inducing the people to accept it as truth, and the further difficulties of making them adopt the cultus therein described, are enormous. For, granted that the people were persuaded to accept the narrative as true, how could it be made to appear that cultus regulations alleged to have been given ages ago and under entirely different surroundings were applicable and binding in times and circumstances as they then existed?

It might be argued, on the other hand, however, that this reasoning proceeds upon a misunderstanding of what took place according to the current hypothesis. It is not maintained that a narrative and a system of cultus were manufactured, so to speak, and imposed on the people. But, beginning with a sacred tradition derived from remote antiquity, there was a real germ of accepted cultus prescriptions. This germ developed itself in a very gradual, but perfectly natural, process of development. The forces that contributed to its development and that effected in time its modification or the substitution of one form or one set of laws for another were subtle, multifarious, and complex. At no time was there a conscious break with the traditions of the past. At no time did conscious and intentional fiction enter in as an element of these transmuting forces.

Dr. Klostermann is on surer ground and argues with greater show of reason when he shows the absurdity of maintaining that the rich and varied Hebrew literature—Job, Psalms, Proverbs, deutero-Isaiah, and the Pentateuch—all originated during a period of comparatively few years, in exilic and post-exilic times.

The reasoning from the light which may be thrown on the history of the Pentateuch from the study of German religious, social, economic, and political history is very felicitous. It is doubtless true, as he says, that modern scholars are influenced more by learned books,

gotten up in the retirement of libraries, and setting forth the unfounded theories and speculations of other scholars, than by a first-hand knowledge of affairs and actual personal study of the field. In the light of Harnack's recent utterances on the subject of New Testament literature, the conclusion does not seem unwarranted that the current pentateuchal hypothesis will eventually meet the same fate that befell Baur's reconstructions of the New Testament literature.

In conclusion Dr. Klostermann states the reasons which convince him that the narrative under consideration goes back to David, and from him to its historical kernel in the wilderness.

The reasonableness, consistency, and inherent probability of the narrative as it stands, particularly in regard to the arrangement of the Israelitish camp and the constructive furnishing of the sanctuary, are put forth with convincing power.

That Moses should have been favored with a divine vision to instruct him as to the sanctuary which he was to construct is argued to have been probable, both from the nature of the case, which demands that divine worship shall be based on divinely communicated regulations, and from various considerations and experiences which prepared him psychologically for receiving such a vision. These were, *first*, the naturalness of entertaining the idea of preparing a place and a sanctuary which should embody the newly revealed idea of the covenant; *second*, the recollection of the sanctuary which God himself erected, with all its sacraments and sacred acts and occupation, for our first parents [this reason is rather fanciful]; *third*, the contemplation of the army of nomadic Israel, dwelling in tents, in the midst of whom Jehovah dwelt; and, *fourth*, his familiarity with the Egyptian practice of using material things, as the letters of a symbolical alphabet, by means of which intelligent expression might be given to important spiritual and sacred truths.

ABEL H. HUIZINGA.

FISHKILL, N. Y.

THE CAMBRIDGE BIBLE FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES. *The Books of Joel and Amos*, with Introduction and Notes. By REV. S. R. DRIVER, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford. Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1897. Pp. 244, 16mo. Cloth, \$1, net.

THE volume upon Joel and Amos will prove one of the most popular issues in the Cambridge Bible series. In it may be observed that